

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3 and 5-10 are now pending, wherein claims 1 and 5-10 are amended and claims 2, 4 and 14 are canceled.

Claims 2 and 4-8 are objected to for minor informalities. Claims 2 and 4 have been canceled and claims 5-8 have been amended to address these minor informalities. Accordingly, withdrawal of these objections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,825,630 to Taylor et al. ("Taylor"). Claims 2-3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of the combination of Taylor and U.S. Patent No. 6,085,137 to Aruga et al. ("Aruga"). These grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed.

Taylor does not anticipate Applicant's claim 1 because Taylor does not disclose all of the elements of Applicant's claim 1. Specifically, this claim has been amended to include the elements of now canceled claim 4, with further amendments to address the claim objections to claim 4. In particular, Taylor does not disclose that "the multilayer module board is a low-end module board, a high-speed module board that operates at higher speed than the low-end module

board or an advanced function module board having more functions than the low-end module board.”

As described on page 2, lines 8-19 of the present application, navigation specifications vary among different vehicle models, which necessitates the design and manufacture of the different navigation circuit boards conforming to the different specifications. In order to address this and other problems, exemplary embodiments provide a base board having low-frequency electronic components and a multilayer module board, mounted on the base board, having a plurality of high-frequency electronic components. The multilayer module board can be a low-end module board, a high-speed module board that operates at higher speed than the low-end module board or an advanced function module board having more functions than the low-end module board. Accordingly, as described on page 16, lines 10-22 of the present application, using the present invention it is no longer necessary to design and manufacture the entire circuit board device for each of the different sets of specifications.

Taylor discloses a printed circuit board 10 that includes a higher density substrate 12 that is built into or soldered onto the circuit board 10. (Col. 3, lines 1-7). Taylor is directed to solving the problem that different technologies cannot be mixed on a single printed circuit board. (Col. 1, lines 49-50). In contrast to Applicant’s claim 1 which recites a number of different types of multi-layer modules and a relationship between these different types of modules, Taylor does

not disclose that different types of higher density substrates 12 can be employed with printed circuit board 10.

To reject the elements of now canceled claim 4 that have been incorporated into claim 1 the Office Action states that “multilayer module board (12) is a high-speed module board that operates at a higher speed than the low-end module board.” The Office Action, however, has not cited to any portion of Taylor that supports this statement. Although Taylor discloses that the substrate 12 is a higher density board compared to circuit board 10, Taylor does not disclose that substrate 12 is “a high-speed module board that operates at a higher speed than the low-end module board”, where the multilayer module board can be a low-end module board or a high-speed module board. Accordingly, Taylor does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 5-8 are patentably distinguishable over Taylor at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Taylor does not anticipate Applicant’s claims 9 and 10 because Taylor does not disclose the four connector terminals recited in these claims. To reject these claims the Office Action does not identify which elements of the device of Taylor correspond to the four connector terminals recited in claims 9 and 10. Accordingly, the Office Action has not provided sufficient information to establish that Taylor anticipates these claims. *Therefore, if this ground of*

*rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests that the next Office Action specifically identify the elements of Taylor that correspond to the four connector terminals of Applicant's claims 9 and 10.*

Nevertheless, Taylor at most discloses pin/cup sockets 33 coupled between printed circuit board 10 and higher density substrate 12. Pin/cup sockets 33, however, are not arranged in the same manner as the four connector terminals recited in Applicant's claims 9 and 10. Accordingly, Taylor cannot anticipate Applicant's 9 and 10.

Aruga is cited for elements of claims 2, 3 and 14, but does not remedy the above-identified deficiencies of Taylor. Accordingly, the pending claims are novel and non-obvious in view of Taylor or the combination of Taylor and Aruga. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3 and 5-10 is respectfully requested.


If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

Serial No. 10/510,567  
Amendment Dated: February 2, 2007  
Reply to Office Action Mailed: October 2, 2006  
Attorney Docket No. 029267.55488US

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #029267.55488US).

Respectfully submitted,

February 2, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen W. Palan  
Registration No. 43,420

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
SWP:crr  
2949502